UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

"Nobler Than Ourselves" - - - - - - - - - - *Henry W. Pinkham*

Why Did France Collapse? - *Devere Allen*

The Things Which Belong Unto Peace - - - - - - - *William Bottomley*

As South Americans See Us - - - - - - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 10

Chicago, July 15, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 147

ARTICLES—
"Nobler Than Ourselves"—HENRY W. PINKHAM 150
Why Did France Collapse?—DEVERE ALLEN 152
The Things Which Belong Unto Peace—WILLIAM BOTTOMLEY 153
As South Americans See Us—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 155
On the Pacifist Front—XVIII 157

POETRY—
Unity—UNA MORCE GIBSON 149
To the Buyers and Sellers—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 151
Minor Solo—CORA G. BURWELL 158

THE STUDY TABLE—
Sinclair's Great Book—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 159
The New Testament As Missionary Literature—C. A. HAWLEY 159

CORRESPONDENCE—
Against Universal Military Training—WILLIAM FLOYD 160
Richard Gregg's Article—BLANCHE WATSON 160
Universal Responsibility for Catastrophe—X 160
"Armageddon"—and Other Matters—HENRIETTE POSNER 160
No Concession to Hitlerism—CURTIS W. REESE 160

THE FIELD—
An Appeal for Czechoslovakia—ALICE G. MASARYK 146
Hindsight Versus Foresight—*The Saturday Review of Literature* 146

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Appeal for Czechoslovakia

Readers of UNITY will be interested in the following letter from Dr. Alice G. Masaryk to the editor of the New York *Herald-Tribune:*

Dear Sir:

Will you find a moment to read these lines in spite of your desk being filled with dispatches, letters and news, and will you find a place in the New York *Herald-Tribune*, an unostentatious place, where those look who are eager for real values and information?

That peace might be preserved, the Czechoslovak nation gave up excellent arms. When giving up the protecting mountains inhabited by Germans, we were promised that we could keep our sacred soil inhabited by Czechoslovaks for a thousand years. Our soil and our culture. The culture of democratic coöperation and respect for other nations. You know what happened.

Let me not dwell on the dark side of life at home. From the papers and broadcasts you know these facts: Universities closed, students shot, food taken, jails filled, working people exported to Germany. Quiet, restrained, hoping for justice and understanding, our people live their Gethsemane. This quiet, dignified strength should be voiced. Please give it expression in your paper.

After September, 1939, a young Unitarian minister and his gentle wife went to help the Czechoslovak people in their hardest days; now they are sailing for France to help the thousands of Czech refugees who fled from Belgium, where they worked in factories and mines to help those who had to flee from their country.

Mr. Editor, I hope you will reach free and rich hearts and willing hands, and that the American readers, not only the Unitarians, will send checks to Mr. Waitstill Sharp, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts, so that the Unitarian mission may help those who suffer not only for themselves but for many. Our ideals live—help the people live.

Respectfully,
Alice G. Masaryk.

Hindsight Versus Foresight

The press has not always been very helpful in this war. It has been brisk in emphasizing the errors of statesmen; it can do no harm to remind itself occasionally of some of its own. On September 25, 1939, *Life* said: "Germany has mostly light tanks. France and Britain, with more big tanks, have clear superiority over Germany." On February 17, 1940, the New York *Times* reported Philadelphia's exultation at getting the G.O.P. convention. The headlines said: "Philadelphia expects 100,000 visitors; estimates they will spend $12,000,000."

(*Continued on page* 156)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, July 15, 1940 No. 10

GOD SMILED

God said, "I am tired of Kings,"
But that was a long while ago!
And meantime man said, "No—
I like their looks in their robes and rings."
So he crowned a few more,
And they went on playing the same as before,
Fighting and spoiling things.

Man said, "I am tired of Kings!
Sons of the robber chiefs of yore,
They make me pay for their lust and their war;
I am the puppet, they pull the strings;
The blood of my heart is the wine they drink.
I will govern myself for awhile I think,
And see what that brings!"

Then God, who made the first remark,
Smiled in the dark.

HENRY VAN DYKE.

GANDHI ON THIS WAR

To readers who cannot understand the Editor's pacifist position in this war—who would protest, for example, such an editorial as "Au Revoir, France" (UNITY, July 1st) as base surrender to despotism and sheer brute force—we commend, with what St. Paul termed "all prayer and supplication in the spirit," the following Associated Press dispatch from Bombay, India:

> Mohandas K. Gandhi, writing in his weekly newspaper *Harijan* today, advocated non-violence as the only way to meet "Hitlerism," which he called "naked, ruthless force reduced to an exact science and worked out with scientific precision."
>
> The aged nationalist leader said that Fuehrer Adolf Hitler was giving the Germans "not the pleasure of owning an empire but the burden of sustaining its crushing weight."
>
> "Hitlerism will never be defeated by counter-Hitlerism," Gandhi wrote. "What is going on before our eyes is a demonstration of the futility of violence and also of Hitlerism. I think French statesmen have shown real courage in bowing to the inevitable and refusing to be party to mutual slaughter.
>
> "The bravery of the French soldier is well known, but let the world know of the greater bravery of the French statesmen suing for peace."

For better or worse, for richer or poorer, in sickness and in health, *we take our stand with Gandhi.* As the early Christians were glad to follow in the non-resistant footsteps of Jesus, so we are glad to follow in the non-resistant footsteps of Gandhi, the sublimest spiritual genius since the Nazarene walked this earth and in the end perished on the cross of the greatest military empire of his day rather than lift arms against it. Strange that we do not see that Hitler represents in Europe today only that same ruthless tyranny of sword and rod which Jesus knew all his life in Palestine and Gandhi has known all his life in India, and that, as they faced what we face, they would not fight! Gandhi states the whole truth of pacifism, or non-violence—that "Hitlerism will never be defeated by counter-Hitlerism," that violence cannot overcome violence but only conspire with it to destroy mankind. When "naked, ruthless force" comes against us, says Gandhi, we must "show real courage in bowing to the inevitable and refusing to be party to mutual slaughter." But this is *not* surrender! Gandhi has never surrendered to Britain, as Jesus never surrendered to Rome. For there is a higher power, and an unconquerable one—the power of the spirit, rooted in God and his omnipotence—which can be used against tyranny to overcome it. Let there be no confusion—*this is where we stand!* The power of the spirit, and this only, would we use against Hitler.

THE SAME OLD WAR!

It seems incredible—but no less a paper than the New York *Herald-Tribune,* most belligerent of American journals, has come 'round to the position that this war is the same old war that began in 1914 and did not end in 1918. Thus, in the leading editorial for Sunday, June 23rd last, the *Herald-Tribune* says:

> As the implications of the armistice terms imposed by Germany on France unfold, it is clearer than ever that the present war is only a continuation of the war which was started on that fateful August morning in 1914. The late Gen. Tasker H. Bliss was right when he remarked in 1918, in reply to the question how long he thought the war would last, that it would go on for from thirty to fifty years. There would be, of course, one or two truces of long duration, he explained, but it would take several decades before the war was finally finished.

This has been our position, as it has been the position of every understanding pacifist, since the very first moment this war began. Indeed, we have been arguing for years past that Versailles only continued the armed struggle of 1914 on another plane, and that the fight was sooner or later bound to break out again. In contravention of this reading of history, the militarist, or non-pacifist, has argued that this war is different! But now the mouthpiece of all militarists, the New York *Herald-Tribune,* declares that "in only one important respect is the situation today fundamentally different from that of 1918: the ambitions and designs of Nazi Germany are even more grandiose than those of

Imperial Germany, and its victory threatens not only vast territorial changes . . . but the imposition of a philosophy of government and economics which is revolutionary." In other words, it is the same old thing, only more of it. Violence has been growing on what it has been fed on all these years! The logic of the *Herald-Tribune's* pronouncement—that "the present war is only a continuation of the [last] war"—is of course obvious, though the *Herald-Tribune* does not see it. This logic has two parts. First, the war of 1914-1918, as we now know, was a war not for democracy or civilization at all, but for sheer sordid imperialistic aims on both sides. If, now, this present war is only "a continuation" of this earlier war, then it too is not a war for ideals but for empire. Secondly, the United States made a foolish, futile mistake in going into the 1914-1918 war. If, now, this present war is only "a continuation" of the earlier war, then the United States will be making a second foolish, futile mistake to go into it again.

"Logic is logic—that's all I say!"

THE HORRORS OF THIS WAR!

Is there any end to the horrors of this war? Agony piles up on agony, until it seems as though the heart of the world could bear no more. As if it were not enough to read of the indescribable agonies of the struggle in Holland, Belgium, France—the blasted cities, the wasted fields, the slaughtered soldiers, the homeless refugees, the lost children—we now read "sorrow's crown of sorrow" in a special United Press cable dispatch from Madrid that the Duke and Duchess of Windsor, fleeing from their villa on the French Riviera, had nothing to eat on the journey but canned sardines! But the Duchess is an heroic woman—"they were most delicious," she said. Not yet, however, have we reached the war's lowest depth of horror, which is described in a dreadful editorial published in the New York *Herald-Tribune*. We know that our readers will cringe to read it—perhaps we should spare them this unmitigable distress! But we should know the worst, especially as this last atrocity of the war is being visited upon us Americans. Says the *Herald-Tribune,* believe it or not:

> So far it has been principally the headlines in the newspapers and the bulletins over the radio that have brought home to Americans the actuality of the conflict in Europe. But soon, if not almost immediately, their consciousness of the holocaust will be heightened by various deprivations, or their equivalent in the rise of prices for the imported luxuries to which they have become accustomed.
>
> We have in mind at the moment the wines and liquors for whose supply this country has been dependent on the nations now engulfed in the Nazi wave or fighting its encroachment. The flow of Pilsner beer to these shores, for instance, stopped a long while ago. Shipments of champagne, we are told, are no longer obtainable. Tomorrow we shall hear, very likely, that no more other wines or liqueurs or vermouth are coming from France. And so the story goes. Even good Scotch promises to become scarce and much more expensive.

The *Herald-Tribune* concedes, with a chilly and chilling imperturbability, that this is perhaps not a perfect "catastrophe." It can be borne, for we Americans are a brave people. But even so, we shall greatly suffer, as witness:

> Should all foreign sources of liquor dry up we can turn to our domestic products and easily forget the pain, if any, of the transition. They are not ersatz. But here, too, we shall be made to feel the impact of Herr Hitler's ambitions. Effective July 1 the trade expects an increase in Federal liquor taxes of about $2.25 a case for fifths and $3 a case for quarts of spirits, and a yet undetermined boost of the taxes on still and sparkling wines.

It was when we read this editorial that we understood at last why the *Herald-Tribune* wants America to get into this war. There are some things, after all, that are too much to bear.

A WHOLESOME LESSON

The outcome of the so-called Christian Front sedition trial in New York is a wholesome commentary on the war hysteria in this country—the "fifth column," the "Trojan Horse," alien spies, and all the rest. Remember what happened! On an appointed day, months ago, the F. B. I. police swooped down upon a little group of less than a score of men in Brooklyn, and arrested them on charges of conspiracy to steal government property, and conspiracy to overthrow the United States government. The papers had all been tipped off, and straightway filled their columns with sensational stories of hidden arms, explosive bombs, military uprisings, threats of assassination and violent revolution, and what not. Here was a full-fledged attempt to destroy this government, and establish in Washington by force and violence a totalitarian dictatorship! To sober readers it sounded like an "Old Sleuth" detective yarn right out of the pulp magazines. But the F. B. I. vouched for the truth of this awful example of sedition and treason, and we had to believe it or else ourselves be called seditionists and traitors. Now see what has happened! A trial lasting almost twelve weeks in a United States District Court before a carefully selected jury of typical American citizens resulted in the acquittal of nine of thirteen defendants on the sedition charge, and of nine of fourteen defendants on the theft charge, and disagreement on the other defendants. After more than four days of deliberation, the jury stood 11 to 1 on the last ballot for acquittal of all the defendants on both charges. What the trial disclosed was a group of ignorant, muddle-headed, foolish, silly young men, all stirred up over dreadful stories about Nazis and especially Communists in this country, especially excited over charges that the Communists were taking over the New Deal, incidentally eaten up with anti-Semitism and anti-alienism as fomented by 100 per cent American patrioteers, and resolving in their stupid way to do something about it. They talked big, were worked upon by fanatics of the Coughlin type, indulged in infantile delusions of grandeur, thought they were valiant Americans—and made asses of themselves. But the F. B. I., who took them seriously, were bigger asses. Calm down—*calm down!*

THE DISGRACE OF THE COMMENCEMENTS

The Commencement orgy is over, thank heaven! Was there ever a more disgraceful exhibition of intellectual debauchery and spiritual depravity? As though with one accord, like bloodhounds baying on the trail, college presidents, professors, baccalaureate preachers, recipients of honorary degrees, alumni speakers, lifted up their voices in advocacy of war, or everything "short of war." Nowhere, even among the politicians, certainly not in the newspapers and the churches, has there been such an outburst of sheer madness in this crisis as at these academic occasions. Had it not been for the students, whose representatives kept their heads with admirable poise and calm, one would have thought that these colleges were not institutions of the higher learning at all, but out-and-out lunatic asylums. One might imagine that our scholars, our trained intellectuals, would be particularly and peculiarly those leaders in our midst who would maintain a cool objectivity in the hour of crisis, who would use the impartial scientific method in their inquiries and judgments, who would look upon current events from the long-range perspective of the historical process, who would be immune to the infantile idea of the enemy always one hundred per cent guilty and ourselves always one hundred per cent innocent, who would not lose altogether the consciousness of moral principle as a solvent of popular prejudice and passion. But no, our professors are the first to lose all sense of balance, and the fiercest in their expression of hate and lust. As the German professors leaped instantly in support of the Kaiser when he invaded Belgium in 1914, as American professors led the pack in support of Wilson in 1917, so American professors, true to form, are yelping and yapping more loudly than all the other dogs of war in their support of Roosevelt in the present desperate hour. What is it that drives these intellectuals, as they are so strangely called, to be the mouthpieces of unbridled emotion? Why do they so furiously rage when they should be so dispassionately reasonable? Is it because they are so safely beyond the conscription age—because the students and not themselves must do the fighting? Or is it because they are so far removed from the realities of life that the sudden intrusion of reality frightens them to madness? We do not know. We are only glad that the Commencement orators are still for another year.

HELP THE REFUGEES

UNITY has more than once spoken of the unprecedented refugee situation in Europe. This situation has existed for a long time—ever since the Bolsheviki seized Russia and drove millions of Tsarists into exile. Then came the refugees from Italy, Germany, Spain, with the Jews, as usual, leading the vanguard of distress. But now from the battle areas of the present war has come such a tide of refugees as the world has never seen before. Numbered by the millions, these wretched men and women from Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, northern France, are threatening to choke England and France, and themselves to perish from famine and disease. With the war continuing with unabated intensity, and the colder weather coming in the fall and winter, this refugee problem promises to take on the magnitude of the greatest catastrophe ever known in human history. Never before, in any flight of multitudes from barbarian invaders, has there been such utter wretchedness on so vast a scale as now confronts us. In this unparalleled emergency, America, of all countries, can be most helpful. We are far removed from the battlefront; we have the money, food, clothing, and medicines needed; we have, it is to be hoped, the Good Samaritan heart. Whatever else we do in this crsis—aid or refuse to aid the Allies, go to war or remain at peace—this one thing of ministering to the fleeing millions of Europe's war-beset population we must do with a single will. Now if ever we must *give*—churches, synagogues, clubs, societies, individuals, *all* must give as they have never given before to save mankind from death. First among the relief organizations is the American Red Cross (Washington, D.C.), now raising $20,000,000 for European war-sufferers. This fund, be it noted, is *not* to be used for wounded soldiers or other military purposes, but strictly for refugees. Next among relief organizations, and most blessed of them all, is the Friends Service Committee (165 West 46th Street, New York City). This Committee has long been busy in all lands, to serve the wretched whoever they may be. It can expand its work immediately to the limit of the money placed at its disposal. Other relief organizations are the Polish Committee, headed by Ignace J. Paderewski, the Queen Wilhelmina Committee, headed by Hendrik Van Loon, the American Jewish Congress aiding stricken Jews, and the Christian Refugee Committee aiding stricken Catholics and Protestants. There is ample opportunity to help—let not one of us miss the chance!

Unity

Some call on Allah, on Allah alone,
Some worship Buddha's pale image in stone,
  Some praise Jehovah, but "what's in a name?"
  Their God and our God are one and the same.

Some, having faith, lift their eyes to the hills,
Some, having faith, can be cured of their ills;
  Each to the true faith, the one faith lays claim,
  Yet their God and our God are one and the same.

Some have been tortured, to faith holding fast,
Some have been martyred and brave to the last;
  Man bestows sainthood, so saints they became,
  For their God and our God are one and the same.

UNA MORCE GIBSON.

"Nobler Than Ourselves"

[We publish the following editorial from the New York *Times* for the sake of the pointed and pertinent reply by the Reverend Henry W. Pinkham, which was declined publication by the *Times*. The statement of pacifism seems never so powerful and persuasive as when placed front to front with the traditional arguments for war.—*Editor.*]

In his address at the Columbia University alumni luncheon Lord Lothian spoke of the necessity that the democracies should recognize "that there is something higher and nobler than ourselves in life, for the sake of which we must hold ourselves ready at any time to lay down our lives, or to leave wife and children, or ease and possessions." He believes this to be "the central lesson of Christianity," as well as an explanation of the success of modern dictators.

It is hard to think of any political doctrine that is not "higher and nobler" than Naziism, yet there can be no doubt that this doctrine did satisfy the needs of a section of the German people—probably not a majority—who were sick of the confusion of a self-centered life. These are the fanatics—brutal and dangerous but honest. If we do not admit that there can be honesty of this sort, we shall underestimate and misunderstand the Nazi movement.

It cannot be beaten down, in battle or in measures short of battle, merely by another fanaticism. Unthinking devotion to a barbaric ideal must be countered by thinking devotion to a civilized ideal. But the devotion must exist. And it must be capable of going to that point where the convinced democrat will admit that there are some things more precious than his own life.

This is a hard doctrine for any of us to face. It takes imagination, because no American is at present being called on to die for freedom's sake. It goes against the grain of our thinking, because circumstances have made us feel safe and have permitted us to put the emphasis upon our rights rather than upon our duties. And most of us are uncertain, in advance of the test, as to whether we are cut out to be heroes.

Yet, whether the test comes or not, we have probably got to revalue our democracy and our lives, the one in terms of the other. Democracy has little meaning if it is thought of merely in terms of political machinery. Its object must be, now and always, the enrichment of the individual life. But, beyond this, we must recognize that the individual life's enrichment is of no general interest unless the individual contributes creatively, in small things or great, to the common welfare. A purely selfish individualism withers at the roots. If the appalling conflict which we are now witnessing destroys that kind of individualism, it will have paid back a little of what it is costing.

We who are not at the moment about to die can with poor grace give advice to those who offer their bodies to the steel. But their sacrifice can have little meaning to us unless we realize, as they have done, that the democratic ideal of the sanctity of the humblest human being can be maintained only by those who hold liberty more sacred than anything that is theirs, even to their lives.

This is a heroic doctrine. It should not degenerate into heroics. But in cold logic there is no escape from it.

To the Editor of The New York *Times:*

The editorial (June 9) with words of Lord Lothian for its caption—"Nobler Than Ourselves"—seems to me to need elucidation. What concretely is the "something higher than ourselves in life, for the sake of which we must hold ourselves ready at any time to lay down our lives"? Lord Lothian's reference to "the central lesson of Christianity" suggests that it is the Kingdom of God to which this supreme devotion should be given. Such was the teaching of the founder of Christianity. And what was the Kingdom of God as he conceived of it? It was a social order of all-embracing good will, a society of freedom and brotherhood. Truly that is something nobler than our individual selves, something well worth living for.

But is even the Kingdom of God worth dying for? That depends. The question assumes that dying will help to realize that noble social ideal more than living will. In very exceptional circumstances that may be the case with an individual or perhaps a few individuals. But the presumption is very strongly to the contrary: it is only rarely, if ever, that one can promote a good cause better by becoming a corpse than by devoting to it the thought and labor of a living personality.

The background of the noble lord's address and of the editorial thereon, as of almost every contemporary speech or writing, is the terrible war in Europe. When anyone speaks or writes today of "something worth dying for," he is understood at once to refer to death on the field of battle. The "heroic doctrine" from which "in cold logic there is no escape" is accordingly that every man should be ready to die for his country, at the call of his government.

This doctrine should be examined in the very coldest of "cold logic." For one thing, it should be noted that the call of a government at war is not primarily for men ready to die, but for men ready to kill their fellow men, which is very different. As to dying the example of Jesus can be adduced, but not as to killing. We cannot sing "As He killed to make men holy, let us kill to make men free." He did not kill. And when a disciple drew his sword and laid about him, Jesus checked him with the words, "All they who take the sword perish with the sword."

Further, Lord Lothian's point that the Nazis seem to have learned thoroughly "the central lesson of Christianity" should be given due weight. It does appear that they are ready to die for something they regard as nobler than themselves, namely, the Fatherland, and more specifically their Fuehrer whom they adore as the God-given savior of their country. There is no reason to doubt that the overwhelming majority of the German people, as of every other belligerent nation, believe that in the present conflict their cause is righteous. In this faith their religious guides, both Catholic and Protestant, support them. Even Martin Niemoeller, the recalcitrant Protestant minister, from a concentration camp has avowed his willingness to resume the role he played in 1914-18 when he commanded a U-boat. Of course, German readiness to die, like British and French, means, in time of war, readiness to kill.

Thus the "heroic doctrine" extolled by Lord Lothian and the *Times* is splendidly exemplified by both the belligerent parties. Which excels the other, who but God can tell? And God—Hitler piously remarked a few days ago, as reported—gives victory in war to those who most deserve it.

"In cold logic" the analysis should go deeper. To die that one's country may live is esteemed a very noble choice and a very happy fate. *"Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori."* But, on the other hand, it seems

evident that a country really lives in the minds and hearts of its living people, not in corpses. Should there not therefore be a limit to the number of those who make that noble choice and enjoy that happy fate? Suppose—in accordance with Kant's criterion of moral conduct, viz., the result when conduct becomes universal—the entire population of a country should die that their country might live, would that country live? Not, I think, noticeably! If nine-tenths should nobly perish, would not the surviving tenth be relatively a poor sort of country, however complete its military victory might be? It would seem as if every government before engaging in war might well determine how large a fraction of its population may be advantageously slaughtered in the name of righteousness before it will clearly be the part of common sense to make peace on the best possible terms, however unsatisfactory such terms may be. Evidently there is a limit. To fix that limit requires a nice balancing of the quantity of human life against its quality. How far should the reduction in quantity go in order to obtain the maximum improvement in quality?

The problem is the more difficult because generally the quality of human life advances *pari passu* with the quantity: the larger the number of human beings—up to the limit of available material means of supporting life—the richer human life becomes. "That country is the richest," said Ruskin, "which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings." Man is by nature social. It is through association with our kind that human life is expanded and enriched. The more extensive the association, and the more intensive, the better. This beneficent association—it is pertinent in the present context to note—is with the living, not with corpses.

Collective homicide—as war was accurately defined by the great Russian sociologist, Novikov—seems hard to harmonize with the law of association just stated. Generally—I admit individual exceptions, but not many—a living human being is preferable to a corpse. The wholesale business of turning living human beings into corpses, with—as a side line—the production of a multitude on whom the process was incomplete, that is, men still living but minus arms or legs or eyes or minds, seems *prima facie* a quite irrational procedure. The logical outcome of such business is the extinction of the human race.

But, paradoxically, it is only human reason that makes possible so irrational behavior. The lower animals are incapable of the like. They have not the mentality to appreciate an appeal like that of Lord Lothian and the *Times*. And therefore a pack of wolves never fights another pack of wolves. Instinct keeps the brutes from preying upon their own species. Man has the same instinct, but his noble gift of reason can and does override that instinct, so that he does that unnatural thing, the killing of his kind. He does this in accordance with the theory in which he has been indoctrinated and which he fully believes, viz., that it was by collective homicide that justice and liberty have been achieved to their present degree, and that sometimes it is only by collective homicide that these great values can be preserved and enhanced. Thus reason enables men to do what is actually unreasonable.

War is enormously exciting and therefore it has inordinately occupied the attention and the imagination of men. *"Arma virumque cano."* Modern anthropologists, sociologists, and historians, however, tend increasingly to the view that it is man's struggle against nature in its hostile aspects—excesses of cold or heat, thorns and thistles, earthquakes and tornadoes, floods and droughts, insect pests and disease germs, tigers and rattlesnakes—not against fellow men, through which his abilities have been developed and his progress achieved. Success in this beneficent struggle, this effort to "replenish the earth and subdue it," has depended on coöperation and mutual aid, and has only been retarded by the sadly numerous episodes of collective homicide. All signs indicate that soon there will be a virtual consensus of the experts that the theory that any war, anywhere, at any time, promoted human welfare is sheer superstition, as groundless as belief in witchcraft and vastly more injurious.

"The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." On the same principle, government was made for man and not man for government. When a government commands its people to shed their blood to an indefinite amount, it is time for its people to abolish that government and create another. Of ideals also it may be said that they were made for man and not man for them. Liberty is for man and not man for liberty. Human life itself is the primary and basic value, the ground of all spiritual values. Liberty, justice, democracy, truth, righteousness, have no existence in a desert or in a cemetery—except when it is visited by the living. To die for liberty is as inherently irrational as the traveler's answer to the highwayman's demand, "Your money or your life!" "Take my life, then, for I need my money for my old age."

I conclude, then, that "in cold logic" the "heroic doctrine" of Lord Lothian and the *Times* is, as applied to war, sentimental, shallow, fallacious, self-contradictory, silly, ridiculous, asinine, idiotic. Collective homicide is simply the worst foolishness conceivable, whatever the circumstances, and it always was. To call it wicked is to flatter it, as a fool is flattered when called a knave. Nations that engage in it, whatever the lofty mouthings of their rulers and their priests, have sunk so far below the brutes that the moral difference between the belligerent parties is negligible. *"Écrasez l' infâme!"*

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

Newton Centre, Mass.

To the Buyers and Sellers

Whether it be a poem or a pound of sugar,
Five yards of cloth or an idea for the salvation of humanity,
Every item has its particular price,
Having been carefully weighed on the scales of your own imagining.
So out of center is this queer standard of measurement
That human life weighs as light as the dust on the pan,—
Which is convenient when oppressing the poor.
The only drawback is, of course,
That, being unable to transmute your own bodies
Into gold or some other valuable element,
Your lives weigh no more than the lives of the unemployed,
Which is regrettable, not to say alarming.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

Why Did France Collapse?

DEVERE ALLEN*

Why so rapid, so complete a crumbling of French defenses under the Nazi *blitzkrieg?* The sheer superior war technique of the invading armies? Or lack of military preparedness? The latter "explanation" is going the rounds of the press throughout the world, and is being seized upon in the United States as a vindication by those who have wanted in the past, and want now, an America armed to the teeth, no matter how obsolete the weapons or the tactical program. If the average American falls for such an idea, he can hardly be blamed, so bombarded has he been by emotional propaganda, so sympathetic has he been, and justifiably so, with the terrible plight of the French people. And has not the new French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Paul Baudoin, declared that "we all were insufficiently prepared for war with its new methods"?

The first defense of any land, as the historian Hallam long ago pointed out, is policy. What was the policy of France, in its essentials? When the Germans were frantically striving to maintain democratic and peaceful post-war governments, French policy put the direst pressure on them, refused coöperation, and drove the German people into the arms of Hitler. Said a former German chancellor, at one time, "If only the French had given me just one little thing that I could have taken to my people as a means of staving off the rising tide of Hitlerism! But I got nothing."

Yet later on, when Hitler was arming for his obvious and indeed his openly proclaimed program of conquest, the French ruling classes coöperated in large measure. Tanks are now given credit by the French military command for the overwhelming German victory; the tanks which in number so vastly outweighed those of the French. Why, then, did France sell 400 heavy tanks to Hitler only a few years before this war began? In the building up of Hitler's vast military machine, France coöperated hardly more than Britain and even America; but it coöperated nonetheless. The essence of policy was to be stern and unrelenting toward peaceful liberals, but to be coöperative and helpful toward Nazis.

A second fatal point in French armor was an outworn, impossible system of defense by a ring of forts. To say this, is not hindsight on the part of the present writer, who put into print as long ago as 1931, in articles sent from France, the view that when a crisis came the Maginot Line would be found useless. Once cracked, there was nothing in the way of a German advance except mobile armies, and these were never trained or equipped for that sort of warfare. Why could such mistakes be made? Because, primarily, France was ruled, as every militaristic country must be, once the military arm gains political control over the civilian arm, by a peculiarly backward, entrenched, tradition-bound caste system of army domination. Militarism can be safely tolerated in a Nazi dictatorship, perhaps; it is fatal in a democracy.

If you *are* going to lean for defense upon an iron ring of fortifications, there can be no breaks in the chain. But France left amazing holes. The writer has visited practically every foot of the frontier defense line along the southern boundary of Belgium; every important Belgian fortification with one minor exception; and has travelled up and down the rear of the Maginot Line. It was not necessary to be a military genius to feel astonishment, in view of the French defense plan, at the incredible weakness of certain points on the French-Belgian frontier, where in the main nothing existed but a few outworn concrete pillboxes, six rows of barbed wire, and four rows of steel rails protruding from the earth.

In fact, this writer crossed the line close to Sedan only a few weeks before the Germans followed. There on all sides were wide, flat fields, totally unfortified; roads without so much as a delay-barrier; and farther on, in back, small concrete blockhouses of a type long ago abandoned wherever new construction was being pushed.

Once the iron ring was cracked, there were no internal defenses worth mentioning. Although trees were cut to the heart in long rows on the highways fifty miles south of Paris, ready to be felled by two blows of an axe, there was little else to stop the German march. From any point of view, whether that of pacifist, militarist, or moderate military preparation, such a fact can only be amazing. It is clear that everything depended, and was planned, on holding the line of the Meuse and the Albert Canal. But here again, the reactionary, unnimble military mind prevailed; for when the comparatively untrained French forces had been sent to this life of defense, and failed to hold the Nazis, there were no other troops in readiness, it appears, to send to their rescue.

That French troops were "outnumbered," as the radio apologists have had it, or were "poorly prepared," or "virtually unarmed," is the sheerest nonsense. The French command claimed at all times since last October 5,000,000 available men; they claimed the best-trained troops, from officer to private, in the world; they claimed the best armor plate and firing capacity. Nor is it even true that the Nazis won by superiority in any way, so much as the Allies lost by hidebound smugness, censorship which deprived their peoples of the facts, and willingness to sell Hitler whatever would bring business interests a profit.

The very crowd to whom falls the unpleasant task—heartbreaking no less for the French people than for those, like the writer, who love so much in French life and character—of making terms with the invading dictators, were working hand in glove with Nazis long before the crisis. In fact, only the start of the war last September hushed up a cabinet scandal of such proportions that hardly anyone halfway informed on European politics failed to know the essentials of it.

It is proper and natural that the shock of grief on the part of France's friends should lead them to push into the background, at first, the true facts about this unparalleled military disaster. But the French people will not long wait to demand and evaluate the truth.

Americans may perhaps derive some lessons, too, from the sad experience of France. One lesson, certainly, is that we should stop now, not later, selling to dictator nations, no matter what the economic cost, war materials for use against weaker nations and eventually, perhaps, against ourselves. It is not intelligent, to cite one recent example, for our Department

*Editor of *Nofrontier News Service,* just returned from an extended stay in Europe.—*Editor.*

of State to protest the bombing of Chungking by the Japanese, when as late as only last March, shipments of American airplane motors were landed at Japanese ports. Our national economy needs rapid reconstruction to prepare us, not for a senseless autarchy, but for freedom from all dependence on orders that fatten the vultures of international politics even more than American purses. This need not lead to militarism or undue regimentation; but the measure of freedom in the development of such a program will be the measure of our willingness to sacrifice whatever of greed may have to go.

The Things Which Belong Unto Peace*

WILLIAM BOTTOMLEY

I refer you to some words uttered by the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, on Sunday last. He said: "The Church has an immense responsibility during war. It has to prepare the real foundations upon which a real peace can be built, not one that will inevitably lead to another war. Let us remember that the greatest thing to be done in this war is to prepare the foundations for a peace that will endure."

Whilst I would add that the Church has just as great a responsibility in times of peace, I am, nevertheless, grateful for those words from the responsible head of the Federal Government. For they do at least indicate that the Prime Minister recognizes the influence which the Church may, if it will, exert in the formulation of principles upon which peace may be established on enduring foundations.

There is one thing, however, which seems to me to be a primary necessity before the Church can do anything of a valued nature in this regard. The Church cannot, if it is to be truthful, if it is honestly to face the facts, make the assumption that we of the British Empire are without sin, and that our enemies are solely responsible for the present hostilities. It is, of course, the policy in every war for each side to blame the other, and to convince the people who are called to fight that theirs is a righteous cause.

The Church is here in a difficult position, for, on the one hand, it is composed of people who are expected to be loyal to the Government in time of war; whilst, on the other, its clear duty is to proclaim a righteous way of life, as much for the nation collectively as for the people individually. But it must not shirk the difficulty. The Church must make up its mind where its real loyalty lies. If loyalty to the Government means that we are to act on the assumption that we are free from blame, that there is no cause for repentance on our part, then it is certain that the Church will not be in a position to guide the people into the way of peace.

Unless the Church, or, at any rate, individual ministers of the Church, are free to point to the evil in ourselves, and to direct people to the support of policies which, because they are in harmony with Christian principles, will inevitably conflict with policies which have brought us into war, then it is hopeless to look to the Church for any moral and spiritual guidance.

What the Church must realize, and what we all should realize, is that certain conditions existed before the war, for which all the nations were more or less responsible. As Dr. R. A. Millikan said, at least eight years ago:

> If we wish to eliminate an old institution like war, we have come to realize that we are not likely to succeed simply by wishing it gone, nor, indeed, simply by pacifistic propaganda of any sort. We are likely to succeed only if the conditions which gave it its survival value have been or can be eliminated.

It is because these conditions were not eliminated—that they were, in fact, perpetuated in an aggravated form—that, in spite of the widespread desire for peace on the part of the people generally, we are now once again engaged in a war the gravity of which is not yet realized in this country, but which probably will be realized before many weeks are past.

The reference to the brilliant physicist, Dr. Millikan, calls to mind an optimistic judgment he made in the same article from which I previously quoted, which events have proved, so far at least, to have been utterly mistaken. He said: "In my judgment, war is now in process of being abolished chiefly through the relentless advance of modern science—the principal diverter of man's energies and interests from the warlike to the peaceful arts."

In the long run, Dr. Millikan may, perhaps, be right, but it is obvious that today science is the handmaid of war more than the handmaid of peace. And why is it the handmaid of war? The answer is because it is the handmaid of capitalistic and financial interests which are bound up with imperialistic policies and international rivalries.

Do not think that I am going to make any particular persons scapegoats for the trouble we are in. Let us honestly admit that we have all been voluntary or involuntary accessories before the fact. When the Empire began its so-called "Defense Policy," though some of us opposed it on Christian and practical grounds, believing that it would only result in war, the majority of the people allowed their fears to be worked upon, and supported the governments who proposed it. There was no influential political voice to urge a different, better, and more effective way. The organized workers, through their political parties, supported it. The churches supported it, if not officially, yet through their members. Is it not admitted that if the Christian Churches had been really set against war, no government could have gone to war?

And so it comes to this: the first thing, the essential thing, if we are to discover the things which belong unto peace, is that we shall ourselves repent. It is no use praying for peace, unless it is a peace on the terms laid down by the Almighty. These terms are not difficult to discover; they may be known by all who wish to know them; the truth is only hidden from those who are unrepentant; who still, for fear of being committed to a way of life which calls for the sacrifice of cherished idols, refuse to face the truth.

What, then, are God's peace terms for humanity? Let me remind you again of Mr. Menzies' words: "The Church has the immense responsibility of preparing all the time real foundations on which real peace might be built." Well, then, what are the real foundations? It must be obvious that the real foundations must be universal. If the Church is to prepare the real foundations it must first be de-nationalized; it must free itself

*An address delivered at the Melbourne (Australia) Unitarian Church on October 1, 1939. Mr. Bottomley, the minister of this Church, is a well-known pacifist.—*Editor.*

entirely from the taint of nationalism and of racialism. Its loyalty must be to the God of all the earth, the Father of all living. It must free itself entirely from all nationalistic ambitions; it must devote itself exclusively to the establishing of the Kingdom of God.

The Kingdom of God is a universal Kingdom, embracing all the people of the earth. When the Church gives its loyalty to earthly imperialisms it is being false to its conception of the Divine rule. And as God cannot be divided, and cannot therefore be expected to be on the side of the British Empire, or any other empire (for that is a denial of His sovereignty), neither can man be divided without going contrary to the Divine will. This is the first practical application of our belief in God as universal ruler and universal spirit of life. All that I shall say hereafter will be but a further application of this truth, and a clarification of those principles, only upon which will it be possible to make a firm and enduring peace.

The second truth, which is complementary to the first, is that mankind is one. Old ideas die hard, and it is difficult even yet for people to realize that there is no essential difference, except in culture, between members of the human race. We still speak in terms of color and of nationality, but beneath all the surface differences there beats the human heart, a child of God.

Scientifically speaking, there is only one human species, and only one human nature. Let us get that truth firmly fixed in our minds. It is absolutely essential if we are to frame our policies in the future on sound foundations. When I am at war with any member of the human race, I am at war with my brother; when I kill my brother I commit the crime of Cain. If I am to be exonerated in this matter, then you must exonerate Cain, for the difference between Cain and Abel was one of competing interests; a quarrel between the pastoralist and the agriculturist, between the farmer and the grazier.

Having got firmly in our minds the truth of the universality of God and the essential unity of man, we can now see that *the things which divide men are the things that make for war.* We are not divided in our human nature, we are divided by our possessions, by a false conception of rights, and by the implicit denial of the fact that nothing that we have is, or can be, ours absolutely. Just think for a moment. Our lives individually are but short on this earth. Our possessions can only be ours for a little time. Yet we allow them to divide us from our fellow men who, like ourselves, are but strangers and pilgrims in the earth. Nationally speaking, there is no finality in our possessions. Think of the changes that have taken place in national frontiers in the world's history, of the rise and fall of empires, of the subjugation of one people by another, and of the needless suffering caused by these fratricidal conflicts. Perhaps many of them were inevitable in times past because of man's ignorance, but today, with immeasurable resources at our disposal, with the advance of scientific knowledge, with the ability to produce all and more than we need, is there any reason, is there any excuse, for the selfish holding of territory and the monopolization of the earth's products?

History and experience point conclusively to the fact that any peace imposed on traditional lines, that is, with the arbitrary fixing of frontiers, with economic advantage to the victors and economic disadvantage to the vanquished, will inexorably mean further wars in the future. If there were no other prospect in view for the human race we might as well renounce all our ideals, proclaim religion a myth and a superstition, and hasten our own destruction to the end. Thus would the history of this ungodlike race be "like a tale told by an idiot, all sound and fury, signifying nothing."

But there is another prospect, to which a sound religion points. It is a world with no national frontiers, no competing empires; a world where there would be the freest exchange of goods, both spiritual and material; a world made free for mankind.

Now I should not be at all surprised if the immediate reaction of many people to such a statement would be a smile of incredulity, and the ready retort that I should stick to practical politics, or better still, as they would think, that I should stick to religion. But, if such should be the case, I would refer you to the grim situation to which we have been brought by our "practical" politicians. Realistic politics, so-called, have brought us where we are. Had there been more idealism, and especially Christian idealism, in our politics, things would have been very different from what they are.

And, secondly, the retort about religion would immediately indicate what has been wrong with our religion in the past. Religion of the hothouse variety, with its emotionalism and false piety, that leaves politics and economics out of its reckoning, is an escape from reality. Realistic religion is religion that permeates life in all its many and varied activities; it gets down to the roots of things; it ascertains the reality of the moral order; it recognizes the value of the individual soul, and demands that life shall be made to serve the soul. A realistic religion will not allow that any human being shall become the instrument of any kind of tyranny, but that it shall be free to coöperate with its fellows in building up a social and political order founded on justice for all.

Let us sum up the things which belong unto peace. They are, first, the recognition of our own share of guilt for the present state of the world, demanding wholehearted repentance towards God and man.

Secondly, our frank recognition that we are living in a world which was made for man, a world in which all have the right to the means and development of life. This involves the renouncing of national sovereignty in favor of a world order, where the resources of the world would be pooled for the benefit of all.

Linked inevitably with this renunciation would be the disestablishing of economic privilege within the nation, the most potent cause of international strife at the present time, because existing governments are the political executives of vested interests.

Thirdly, and really a part of the foregoing, the recognition of the sacredness of human personality, with its right to freedom as a child of God.

In the early days of Christianity, before the Church was officially recognized by Constantine, and therefore before it had compromised its soul, Christians were noted, and were persecuted, for their way of life. They were in conflict with a pagan civilization, and they passively resisted all attempts to win their approval of, and to give their support to, an earthly imperialism. The Romans were tolerant of all religions, but only so long as they did not conflict with the political power. It was precisely because successive Roman emperors recognized in Christianity an implicit danger to the state, as the state was so conceived and so constituted, that the Christians were persecuted. But as the Church conformed more and more to the existing political order,

persecution correspondingly decreased; until, at last, and because the Church had become so influential that it threatened to divide the state and make an issue between the ecclesiastical and the imperial power, Constantine gave it the imperial blessing and, by making it the state religion, secured its allegiance. Thus the Roman Empire became nominally Christian, whilst remaining pagan in heart and practice.

As in those days of long ago, so today we are nominally Christian, but actually pagan; for empire, dominion, with its rivalries and periodical wars, belongs to the pagan conception of life. Opposed to this is the Christian conception of a commonwealth of free peoples throughout the world, united in the bonds of brotherhood and peace. It is the task of the Church to recapture this vision, to educate its members in true religious principles, and to use its influence in such a way that the kingdoms of this world shall become the Kingdom of God. It was for this that Jesus lived, and for this that he died; and because he saw in prophetic vision the fate of those who rejected this commonwealth of love, he wept over Jerusalem, and cried: "If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes."

As South Americans See Us

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

What are those charming—and irresponsible—Latin Americans reading and thinking about the people of the United States today? It may give some of us who are in a dither about the mighty menace of Nazi or Fascist penetration of our far-flung Western Hemisphere, (about which we really know so little), a judicious pause to learn that many even of the better educated citizens of the rising Latin-American republics still look northward with lively apprehension, as they observe our mounting military preparations, our expanding commercial aviation and, above all, our naval bases, steadily encroaching in their direction. Having encircled the Caribbean and seized the Isthmus of Panama in recent years, as history is counted, we are now (according to recent rumor in Washington), secretly reaching out to grasp even the Brazilian Island of Fernando Noronha, situated in the Atlantic Ocean far off the great projecting shoulder of the continent that points towards Africa. Rumor also has it that the Brazilian Government has rebuffed this latest maneuver of the American Naval Department and declined to lease the island "for purposes of aerial defense" to the United States, although we are unable to corroborate this. But certain it is that many Latin Americans look askance at the newfangled notion in North America that the Government of the United States is responsible for the "hemispherical defense" of all the Americas, with or without their request; and in casting the dubious shield of the American navy over the whole continent, with or without its consent. For many of them still consider the commercial Colossus of the North as an exploiting "vampire" in the matter of the "development" of the rich natural resources of the tropical and sub-tropical countries of the "other Americas," and even as a menace to their old literary cultures greater than any that threatens them from Europe.

All this may not be news to many of us. But it is news, indeed, to learn that, despite the advance of public education and intercommunication in and between the Americas, many Latin-American editors and professors as well as the men-in-the-street below the Rio Grande think of the United States as a Great American Desert, culturally speaking—as the native habitat of the creator, if not of the brothers of Tarzan and the apes; and as a sort of continuing, high-pressure Wild West show, operated by and for supersalesmen and show girls, whose major domo is "Buffalo Bill"! Indeed, the picture that they now have of us seems to approximate our own picture of ourselves seventy-five years and more ago, by virtue of what the anthropologists call the "cultural-lag" in the no-longer-isolated Americas.

Some interesting facts and figures concerning the translation and current sale of North American literature in Latin-American lands have recently come to our attention. Although no less than thirty novels and novelettes by Latin-American authors have been translated into English and published in one or more editions in the United States, in recent years, according to Mrs. Concha Romiro James, of the research staff of the Pan-American Union in Washington, the "balance" of cultural payments has at last begun to flow from north to south—not merely in the form of tourists and typewriters in search of romantic adventures "down Mexico way," but also in the form of respectable books, ideas of government and political economy, sanitation, engineering, music, and radio broadcasts. A recent canvass of publishers' catalogues and of booksellers' activities in South America reveals, however, some discouraging facts, according to certain surveys conducted by Professor Sturgis Leavitt, of the University of North Carolina, and Professor John Engelkirk, of the "Instituto de las Espanas," of New York City.

No standard works on North American history, government, economics, art, or architecture, no authoritative treatise concerned with the origins and development of democracy and the secular culture of the American people, appear to be available in Spanish or Portuguese translation for Latin-American consumption and edification. But an astonishingly large number of popular and quasi-juvenile works of fiction and tales of imagination, largely reflecting a sphere of life that has long since passed away, have made their way across the deserts and the jungles of Latin America, and are avidly read in the interior, as well as the coastal cities, in Portuguese as well as in Spanish. In the absence of governmentally subsidized libraries of American literature—of the kind of "cultural propaganda" which the French for many years, and the Italian Government in recent years, have liberally supplied to Latin America—the ordinary course of commercial events has led to the production, if not the pirating, of a curious array of North American literature in Latin America.

According to a checkup recently made, the fourteen most popular and most widely-advertised works of North American authors, in Hispanic America, are: *The Adventures of Nick Carter* (available in 137 different titles); *The Adventures of Buffalo Bill* (in 116 titles, contained in 16 volumes and 60 pamphlets);

the works of James Fenimore Cooper, *Leatherstocking Tales* (in 30 volumes). Then come: the novels of James Oliver Curwood (36 different titles); the adventure stories of Bertha Ruck (29 titles); the novels and stories of Edgar Rice Burroughs; of Elinor Glyn (26 titles); of Zane Grey (26 titles); of Jack London (19 titles); of Peter B. Kyne (17 titles); of Grace L. Hill and William McLeod Raine (8 titles each). Standard editions of the poems and stories of Edgar Allan Poe are still being published occasionally, and sold frequently; and likewise, of Mark Twain. This appears to exhaust the lists of North American lore. Predominating overwhelmingly are adventure stories of the once Wild West, especially of the "cowboy"—the North American equivalent of the South American gaucho—and of frontier life which is as far removed from that of the generation of North Americans now living as it is from the life of Buenos Aires and Rio—farther away, in fact.

According to Professor Torres Rioseco, well-known Chilean writer and professor now teaching in the University of California, there is a widespread trend away from the romantic school of Spanish-American literature, and from the French novel of society, which has long been regnant in Latin America, as also along the Mediterranean. A new "reading public" has appeared with new interest, especially in Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, which demands "progressive" or "leftist" literature of realistic and even "political" character, involving the interplay of character in the collision of social forces and political ideologies. Among recent American fiction *Gone with the Wind* and John Dos Passos' *42nd Parallel* have recently been translated and published in Spanish, as have several plays of Eugene O'Neill and Erskine Caldwell. The "intellectuals" are reading these with interest in Latin America; but they still look to France for their principal literary inspiration and delight, particularly to the writings of André Maurois and André Malraux. The increasing influx of political refugees from Spain appears to be responsible in part for a great increase of interest in serious and political literature, among the patrons of the booksellers of South America and Mexico.

Under the patronage of the Department of State's new Division of Cultural Relations, a representative of North American publishers has recently toured Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina, carrying with him a display of 2,500 volumes of contemporary works by citizens of the United States in English. This constitutes, perhaps, the first semi-official cultural exhibit ever sent to Latin America from Gringo-land. Here, let us hope, is the harbinger of a better era now dawning of more cordial and sympathetic interest, and of far deeper mutual understanding, on the part of the American peoples of the twenty-one affiliated republics of Anglo-Saxon and Latin America. Is the Western Hemisphere at last discovering itself as a potential theater of coördinated and complementary economic, political, and cultural activity, with a common aspiration for democracy and social justice and a common detestation of the war system of Europe, now devastating and darkening the world? Perhaps the awful collision of capitalist imperialism and socialistic militarism that is now drenching Europe and the nearer East in terror of annihilation can be interdicted, can be kept from invading the Western Hemisphere, by an enlarged understanding of common problems and responsibilities in life and government—especially on behalf of the favored to the underprivileged—which it is the function of fine art and literature to increase in all ages of culture of the so-called Christian world. Certainly the opportunities of creative achievement in every field of constructive physical and cultural achievement between the no-longer-isolated nations of the Western Hemisphere were never so abundant as in this hour of common danger and challenge.

It is encouraging to note the appearance in the United States of a new quarterly of somewhat academic character, entitled *The Inter-American Quarterly,* now published in Washington, in English; and to hear of plans for a still more ambitious magazine—*The Pan-American*—devoted to the affairs and unfolding life-history of the Americas, which may make its initial bow this summer. The Harvard University Press already publishes an encyclopaedic *Handbook Guide to Latin American Studies* in the United States for the use of scholars and writers. This is edited by a committee headed by Dr. Lewis Hanke, who is established at the Library of Congress, under its new Hispanic-American Foundation. Similar bibliographical studies of Brazil and Portuguese Americana are under preparation, under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies. . . Here is gratifying evidence that all is not yet lost, in the general flight from Reason abroad; and that "on the shores of darkness, there is light." But is there *light enough* in our minds and hearts, to save us from the annihilating anarchy of war, by forging the indispensable instrumentalities of international collaboration and security, particularly in our American republican hemisphere? Is there a constructive political will and sufficient capacity latent in the Americas to create a League of Freedom and Friendship among them, able to oppose the menace of the all-devouring dictatorships and war systems of Europe and Asia, and to administer the joint responsibilities of the Hemisphere? Where is the statesman and the statesmanship that the defense and development of Pan-American democracy now so urgently requires?

The Field

(*Continued from page* 146)

On March 31, 1940, Captain Liddell Hart said in the New York *Times:* "The issue of this war is more likely to depend on a psychological than on a military initiative." On May 3, 1940, a Dutch correspondent in the London *Spectator* said: "Holland has not allowed herself to be frightened. The natural defenses of the country have been exploited to such purpose that invasion is made extremely difficult." On May 6, 1940, the London *Times* said in an editorial: "The Germans will presumably now try to overrun Northern Norway." On May 17, 1940, the Manchester *Guardian* said: "Military men look for Marshal Gamelin's counter-stroke with confident expectation." On May 18, 1940, London *Cavalcade* ("The Journal That Keeps Thinking People Well Informed") said: "The Man of the Hour Is Generalissimo Gamelin. A philosopher of war with an ice-cold brain . . . he has the measure of the house-painter-turned-Napoleon."

The Saturday Review of Literature.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XVIII

The New York *Times* publishes the following local news story:

Five hundred Jewish Boy Scouts and 200 Cub Scouts took part in the planting of a tree in dedication to world peace at the annual celebration of Lag B'Omer, Jewish tree-planting festival, on the Long Meadow at Prospect Park, Brooklyn. The tree, a small elm, was placed near the Picnic House.

Edward Shilitto, London correspondent of the *Christian Century,* reports as follows in a recent issue of that paper:

Measures will be taken to deal with traitors who deliberately serve the German plans; the penalty of death may be inflicted henceforth upon such men. There is a determination that what happened at Oslo and Amsterdam shall not happen here. A strict watch is being kept upon societies which have sympathy for Hitlerism, and *also upon the peace societies, in case they should attempt to weaken the loyalty of the forces.*

Michael V. Mirande, commander of the Kings County American Legion in New York, made a speech on Memorial Day which is still being quoted. He said, according to the New York papers:

We have learned that it is practically impossible to end war in the Old World through the process of war. We were the world's prize fat boy, with a bag of candy, among a horde of hungry urchins back in '17. We have been so ever since. . . . What did it cost in dollars?—just 40 billion. Also years of terrible depression, 200 billion dollars of lost income and production. It has loaded our future with debts and taxes that chain our younger generation like slaves to the oars of a Roman galley. . . . What did we get for the deadly price we paid? We were told we were going to get international decency. We were bamboozled in the beginning and defrauded in the end. Where is the European democracy we fought to create? Who paid the debts owed to the United States? . . . Yes, our departed comrades may truly groan in their anguish that it was all in vain. . . . We cannot have peace by wishing or begging for it. . . . We must be so fearless and so confident in our unity that we can be the rightful masters of our own nation's destiny.

Dr. William K. Anderson, of the Franklin Street Methodist Church, Johnstown, Pa., has proposed that an army be formed of those "who are willing to die without killing," and who would go out to meet the invader "unarmed except for a New Testament in their hands, and a hymn like 'A Mighty Fortress Is Our God' on their lips." Dr. Anderson announced his willingness to join such an army.

A storm of boos, hisses and jeers from Harvard Seniors greeted an alumni speaker at the Harvard Commencement who extolled entrance into the European war. The speech by David R. Sigourney, '15, of Boston, and its reception by the Harvard students were reported by the New York *Times* as follows:

"We of the class of 1915," Mr. Sigourney declared, "thought that we were to be released from fighting again forever, but we are beginning to see now that this was not so. We should consider it a duty and a privilege to fight for the safety of our country.

"We would be proud to see our Allies again, and we would continue to support them shoulder to shoulder."

Each sentence was met with a round of boos and hisses, making it almost impossible to hear the speaker. Several times he pleaded for consideration.

The old game of blaming the pacifists for war was played by Ex-President William Allan Neilson, of Smith College, in a speech at the Radcliffe College Commencement in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Dr. Neilson said:

Your attitude, the attitude of so-called intellectuals in America, the attitude of the so-called isolationists, have not been matters affecting only our own country. We have profoundly influenced events in Europe, because it was, to a large extent, the assurance of the large pacifist element in England, France and America, and the strong isolation sentiment in America that made Hitler decide on what was safe for him to attempt.

The Northeastern Jurisdictional Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, meeting at Atlantic City, was challenged to adopt a resolution recommending that the United States extend to Great Britain every assistance short of war, and adopted instead a resolution calling on the President to appoint a day of prayer for peace. The resolution as adopted read:

We request bishops of this jurisdiction to call on the President to proclaim a day of prayer for the blessings of God on the country in these critical days; for His guidance in determining our national policy, and for the manifestation of His will for the establishment of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world.

The New York *Herald-Tribune* publishes the following:

Churches should not be an instrument of war, Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, said yesterday in announcing that the duty of churches in time of war would be the theme of a national religious conference of all denominations to be held August 4 to 7.

The *Christian Register* publishes, on behalf of the American Unitarian Association, the following announcement:

Pursuant to the resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 23, the executive committee at its meeting on June 6 voted to instruct the president of the Association to accept and record "voluntary written statements by Unitarians of their objection to participation in war."

This action by the executive committee officially establishes the registry called for by the resolution of the Association. Any Unitarians desiring to have their names entered upon it should communicate directly with the president of the American Unitarian Association, stating their formal connection with a Unitarian parish and their desire to be registered at the denominational headquarters as objecting on grounds of conscience to participation in war.

It should be borne in mind that this action by the executive committee in carrying out the will of the Association does not in any way imply that the Association, officially or unofficially, endorses the views of the conscientious objectors, but is an expression of respect for their right to hold those views, in accordance with our basic Unitarian belief in the sovereignty of the individual conscience.

A staff correspondent of the *Christian Century* sends in the following:

Sergeant Alvin York has at last consented to have a film

made depicting his life. But he made the stipulation that it must be a peace and not a war picture, that he himself will not reënact his exploit in the Argonne, and that the large sum to be paid for it will go to his new Bible school. He once refused an offer of $150,000 just to reënact the few minutes in which he captured 132 German soldiers with his sharpshooting rifle, saying, "I don't want my children ever to see me do that." All together he has turned down offers of a half-million to exploit his fame as the most publicized private soldier in the A. E. F. He lives on his valley farm on the Wolf river in Fentress county, Tennessee, makes many addresses on temperance, peace, and religion, remains unspoiled by attention, and keeps his friendliness and good humor.

From war-bound Canada comes the following item, clipped from the Montreal *Daily Star:*

The official board of Grace United Church, Lachine, of which Rev. William G. Berry, M.A., D.D., is minister, has passed a resolution affirming Dr. Berry's right to register his vote in any public meeting as he sees fit, and affirming confidence in his loyalty to the British Empire.

At the Montreal and Ottawa Conference of the United Church of Canada, held in St. James Church, Rev. Dr. William Monroe, secretary of the conference, introduced a statement calling "upon all to whom God and righteousness are the supreme realities of life to give themselves to this sacred cause [the war] with singleness of purpose, dedicating to it all their powers and grudging no sacrifice, whether of comfort, wealth, or life itself which will secure for us and for our children, the precious things won for us by our fathers."

The resolution was opposed by Rev. C. Halliday, of Montreal West United Church, because, he said, he believed that war was sin and he asked that his vote be recorded against it. When the vote was taken six ministers had made the same request, among whom was Dr. Berry. The next day Dr. Berry protested against the publication of the names of the six ministers, declaring that it would make them victims of public attack.

Today, through J. J. Smith, recording steward of the Lachine church, it is reported that "at a very well attended meeting of the official board of Grace United Church, Lachine, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved that the official board of Grace United Church, Lachine, having heard a statement from its minister in the matter of the recently presented resolution in the Montreal and Ottawa Conference of the United Church of Canada, concerning his non-concurrence therein, affirms the right of its minister to register his vote in any public meeting as he sees fit, and also affirms its confidence in his loyalty to the British Empire and the Dominion of Canada, and its complete confidence in him as its pastor and guide in spiritual matters."

The *Christian Century* publishes the following news item:

A new organization known as the Roll Call of American Women, which has as its chief purpose to keep America's men out of Europe's wars, has been organized in Chicago, with Miss Harriet Vittum, head resident of the Northwestern University Settlement, as its national president. Already more than 200 cities have enlisted in the campaign, which will reach its climax with a mass meeting of women to be held in Chicago in September. Women interested in this movement are urged to write to Roll Call headquarters at 310 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago.

The Boston *Herald* publishes the following report:

The Rt. Rev. William Appleton Lawrence, Episcopal bishop of western Massachusetts, told a group of church leaders last night that he hoped the United States would not fight if attacked, because, he said, "some nation has to make the test of Christian faith."

"Germany may take possession of the United States," he declared, "but Christian faith is unkillable. We must have respect for ideals, not for land and property."

Speaking at the conference for church work at Wellesley College, Bishop Lawrence described himself as a pacifist before an audience of 400, "not that I do not care as much as anybody about what happens in the future, but a good pacifist believes implicitly in love of God and its far-reachedness.

"We do not feel we are traitors," he said, "as we have the highest interest of the country at heart. War is an instrument of national policy and religiously irreconcilable. I am not opposed to war because of its utter futility, devastating destruction, and wastefulness, but because I am a believer in Jesus Christ and because of my religious convictions."

The New York *Times* publishes the following news item:

With 2,500 nuns of the order of the Religious of Mary Reparatrix in many parts of the world participating in prayer, a novena for lasting world peace was opened yesterday with a solemn high mass at St. Leo's Roman Catholic Church. More than 500 persons attended the mass.

Officially known as the Somen Novena of Holy Hours for Peace, the novena will continue for the nine consecutive days with mass each morning at 8 o'clock and holy hour's devotions at 5 P. M. and at 8 P. M., both of which will be marked by a sermon.

Numerous Catholic organizations in the metropolitan area will attend the services during the nine days of adoration. The nuns started a twenty-four hour daily vigil yesterday before the altar, which will continue until the novena is completed.

At a solemn high mass, which marked the opening of the novena, Mgr. William A. Courtney, pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, was the preacher.

He told the gathering that the key to world peace was to be found in God and that "without Him and His teachings we can do nothing."

In urging charity he emphasized that the man who has fallen by the wayside should be helped and that persons "should not be too hasty in criticizing others, the plight of whom they do not know."

"I must love my neighbor, I must help my neighbor," he said.

The Religion and Labor Foundation, of which John Haynes Holmes, Jerome Davis, John A. Lapp, and others, are directors, has issued a statement declaring that "the supreme task confronting America is to keep alive in the world the principles of justice, freedom and democracy, but to do this we must stay out of the war."

The *Fortnightly Review* of London has published an article by the Bishop of Chichester on what should be the attitude of the church in wartime. Among other things, the Bishop says:

The Church ought to declare, both in peacetime and wartime, that there are certain basic principles which can and should be the standards of both international and social order and conduct. Such principles are the equal dignity of all men, respect for human life, the acknowledgment of the solidarity for good and evil of all nations and races of the earth, fidelity to the plighted word and the appreciation of the fact that power of any kind, political or economic, must be coextensive with responsibility.

It should set itself against the propaganda of lies and hatred. It should be ready to encourage a resumption of friendly relations with the enemy nation. It should set its face against any war of extermination or enslavement and any measures directly aimed at destroying the morale of a population.

The Church's supreme concern is not the victory of the national cause. It is a hard thing to say, but it is vital. Its supreme concern is the doing of the Will of God, whoever wins, and the declaring of the Mercy of God to all men and nations.

Minor Solo

A dictator playing solo parts
Destroys all tones of a chord
His quivering strings are human hearts,
His taut-drawn bow, a sword.

CORA G. BURWELL.

The Study Table

Sinclair's Great Book

WORLD'S END. *By Upton Sinclair. New York: The Viking Press.* 740 *pp.* $3.00.

This latest novel by Upton Sinclair has been met with great acclaim by the critics who have so long neglected his other work. This is his greatest book, is their judgment. We are not so sure about this! As we remember *The Jungle, The Metropolis, Oil, Boston,* we find it difficult to make so prompt and sure a rating. We are content to leave this to posterity, already anticipated by a recognition in foreign countries which have long read Sinclair more widely and enthusiastically than any other American author. But that *World's End* is a great book, especially significant and important for these times, of this we are certain. Timeliness combines with superb artistry, ripe wisdom, and a masterful command of rich and varied resources, to make this story memorable.

Current advertisements of *World's End* refer to the author as "a Zola of Today." This characterization is not new, and is impressively true. There is a striking parallel between the immortal works of the French novelist and those of the American novelist, to say nothing of the E. P. I. C. episode as matching the Dreyfus episode. Other comparisons are valid—as, for example, Voltaire who was an accomplished literary artist in many fields, and in addition was the greatest pamphleteer of his day as Sinclair is of ours. But *World's End* suggests neither Zola nor Voltaire, but rather Romain Rolland in his Nobel Prize masterpiece, *Jean Christophe. World's End* begins at just the point where *Jean Christophe* leaves off—the year, 1913. It follows on through the war to Versailles and the opening of the post-war era. Like the French novel, it has enormous bulk and range, a vast panorama of scenes and characters, profound insight into the meaning of an age and its destiny for mankind, a sense of irony and tragedy, and the wisdom that understands rather than condemns. There is more poetry in Rolland's book, as there is more humor in Sinclair's. Both have literary stature, and loom large against the background of these times.

As Rolland sees his pre-war Europe sweeping to its doom through the eyes of his French boy, Jean, so Sinclair sees Europe and the world of our time plunged into the war and after through the eyes of an American boy, Lanny. This boy, born in Europe and largely reared by his beautiful, indulgent, and luxury-loving mother, is the son of an American munitions magnate, who moves early and profitably among the great ones of Europe—diplomats, statesmen, soldiers, industrialists. In his home and social life with his mother and in his behind-the-scenes experiences with his father, Lanny, intelligent, sensitive, discerning, sees the spectacle of a civilization which has become corrupt in its greed of gain and rotten in its lust of luxury and pleasure. He is pretty much protected from the other side of the picture—that of the exploited millions whose poverty makes possible the wealth of the upper crust—but now and again, in some of the most unforgettable passages in the book, these lower depths come to view, and Lanny sees the reality of his world.

The book is long, and moves through an amazingly varied and significant succession of scenes. Into the story break constantly the rumblings and crackings of world events. Contemporary world figures are brought into the tale, not as mere names in the text, but as actual characters in the scenario—Bernard Shaw, Anatole France, Isadora Duncan, Zaharoff, the famous and infamous munitions salesman (a brilliant characterization!), Woodrow Wilson, Clemenceau, Lincoln Steffens, and others. With the coming of the war, Lanny is taken for his first visit to America—an episode which gives Sinclair a marvellous opportunity, abundantly availed of, to picture this country in the amazing days of 1917-18. There are charming and daring love affairs, the heroines of which are among the most successful features of the book. All through the story there runs a lovely friendship between the American, Lanny, and an English and a German comrade, which develops in the end into a plot of sensational and poignant interest. On his return to Europe, at the close of the war, Lanny becomes attached as a secretary to the American peace delegation at the Versailles Conference, and through his eyes we behold the tragic scandal of the making of the treaty which made inevitable the present conflict. It is in this tremendous event that Sinclair builds the climax of his book. With amazing ease he moves among the plots and plans and personalities of Paris in those dreadful days, and in Lanny's growing disillusionment lays bare the soul of a desperate and despairing generation. The closing paragraph is terrible with truth:

> "Pax vobiscum! E pluribus unum! God save the king! And now let's get this room in order!" Lanny took the suitcase which he had brought from the Prefecture, and put it on the bed. * * * "Tomorrow I leave for the Côte d' Azur, and lie on the sand and get sunburned and watch the world come to an end!"

This hasty sketch in review of Sinclair's book gives a hopelessly inadequate idea of its magnitude, range of interest, scope of observation, and depth of understanding. A fascinating and at times highly exciting story is fused with a momentous document of the times in the artistry of which Upton Sinclair has so long been the master. Perhaps never before has he been so serene and sure in his accomplishment as in this book. He may well be proud of his work, as he must be happy in its rapturous reception.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The New Testament As Missionary Literature

PIONEERS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. *By Floyd V. Filson. New York: The Abingdon Press.* 194 *pp.* $2.00.

This book traces out the origin and development of the Christian Church from its home in Judaism. The independent Gentile Church grew up through a succession of missionary leaders. History is the biographies of great men. The larger part of New Testament literature is a record of the spread of the Gospel through the first century Heralds. Since missionaries began the New Testament, Professor Filson agrees with Professor James Moffatt, that "no modern literature offers more light on the New Testament than books by and about missionaries." When one ponders this, he sees its vital truth. The great missionary Heralds chosen for biographical study by Professor Filson are Peter, Stephen, Barnabas, Paul, and James. The book is well-written and ought to be cherished by all serious students of the New Testament.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

Against Universal Military Training

Editor of UNITY:

Defense against the terrible Hitler is essential, but we should not permit his successful *blitzkrieg* to drive us into action that will destroy the very freedom which distinguishes our democracy from the dictatorships.

Hitler may or may not be planning a military attack upon our shores, but he is already Hitlerizing America. He is changing our civilization disastrously. He is forcing our government to increase its debts and its taxes; he is transferring one-fourth of the Works Progress Administration's appropriations to the national preparedness drive, with possible denial of relief to those who do not join the army. He is militarizing us to such an extent that a United States Senator has already proposed the seizure of Mexico by our government in an emergency. Our navy is to be increased 70 per cent. And now comes conscription for war service in peacetime, an un-American procedure that would have shocked our founding fathers who depended upon the minute men to repel the invader.

It must be remembered that as the great British fleet was unable to obtain a foothold in Norway, only 300 miles away, the difficulties surrounding the seizure of a stronger country 3,000 miles away are insurmountable even for a military genius like Hitler. He can invade us only by obtaining a base in the Western Hemisphere.

Military training for 2,000,000 men would not prove effective in case of an invasion by tanks and bombing planes. France mobilized 6,000,000 trained soldiers to no avail. Some other form of defense must be adopted.

Our defense has been most inadequate. We have spent vast sums enlarging our navy only to find that others keep pace with us. Our negligence has been partly responsible for the disastrous conditions existing today. We supinely permitted Japan to invade China in 1931 and we have continued ever since supplying war material and providing funds by the purchase of silk. Mussolini was watching; Hitler was watching; Stalin was watching. They realized that if Japan was permitted to overrun China they would be permitted to seize whatever territory they desired.

The most important defense at the present time is to prevent Hitler from obtaining a base in the Western Hemisphere. The fifth column, so largely responsible for his success elsewhere, must be eliminated before it gains strength.

Our laws should provide that whenever Congress shall decide that our existence as a free nation is menaced by any foreign power, the nationals of that power shall be deported or placed in concentration camps. Every safeguard should be placed around peaceful aliens, but if liberty is to be abridged, it is preferable to suppress aliens whose primary allegiance is to their native land rather than conscript our own citizens.

WILLIAM FLOYD,
Editor, the *Arbitrator*.

New York City

Richard Gregg's Article

Editor of UNITY:

Richard Gregg's piece (UNITY, June 17th) is superlatively fine. I can see, knowing him so well, that a deal of thinking went into it. His paragraph *re* the imposition of "ruthless terms," humiliation and enslavement, not lasting even half a generation, as did the results of Napoleon's activities, and his sentence "and social processes since Napoleon's day have greatly speeded up"—these are well said.

BLANCHE WATSON.

New York City.

Universal Responsibility for Catastrophe

Editor of UNITY:

Your visits with me through UNITY give me deep satisfaction. However, I feel at times that I want to say to you a few words of warning in regard to UNITY, for I seem to glimpse something out of the ordinary. I mean when you write your editorials emphasizing the guilt of certain dictatorial powers, as if they are the only ones to blame for the European situation. We must remember that the present world catastrophe is the result of the seeds that mankind has sown, and that today we are reaping the matured fruits.

Thrums, B. C., Canada. X.

"Armageddon"—and Other Matters

Editor of UNITY:

When I read your editorial, "Armageddon," in the June 3rd isssue of UNITY, I was reminded of a little article I had read recently by Annie Besant, enclosed herewith. (See below. Ed.)

I loved what Curtis Reese wrote of Emma Goldman in this issue. Emma's autobiography, *Living My Life*, is certainly one of the most fascinating books I ever read. Emma was one of the most original human beings one can ever hope to meet.

And thanks for what you wrote about George Lansbury. I heard him speak in Rochester when he was in town for Peace. Kirby Page, that tireless worker, was with him. What a tower of strength Lansbury was! Here was a man who exemplified religion.

HENRIETTE POSNER.

Rochester, New York.

[Enclosure]

The world is rent with a frightful war. Man is battling against man with every assistance that science, turned to the most demoniacal ends, can furnish for human destruction. . . Science is turned to the vilest of purposes, because it has not a conscience behind it; it seeks new instruments of destruction; it endeavors to make liquid fire to burn; it tries to make poisonous gas to torment and slay; it makes new explosives which will kill more men than the latest explosives of the enemy.

Take one power that was almost discovered, the power by which the atom is disintegrated, a power so tremendous that the disintegration of a single atom would spread widespread destruction on every side.

Is that knowledge to be placed in the hands of men who seek to destroy, who are full of hatred, who seek to oppress and to tyrannize, who care not what hearts are broken nor what homes are ravished, if only ambition may be satisfied and the crown of the world be placed upon a single brow? Are such people fit to know?

Nay, it had been better that science had not progressed as far as it has progressed today; and until the social conscience grows, until men learn to love and not to hate, until they realize that the brain must be the servant, not the master, it had been better that they should have remained more ignorant than they are today.

This civilization to which we belong stands condemned, because knowledge is turned to evil and not to good.

A revival of religion is necessary for all future progress. . . It was said of the old Hindu that he slept religion, ate religion, thought religion—Max Muller said it. That is true, and that must come back not only to the Hindu but to every religious mind. . .

—*Annie Besant, 1917.*

No Concession to Hitlerism*

Editor of UNITY:

In your recent editorial note, "Au Revoir, France," I fail to see the logic of your conclusion that since it was wise for France to save Paris by its strategic abandonment of that city, it would also have been possible last September to settle the Polish question without resistance to Hitler and "the task begun of reordering the world on the basis exacted by the new forces of our time." In the first place, I know of no reason to suppose that had England and France handed Poland to Germany, as they did Czechoslovakia, Hitler would have been satisfied. On the contrary, I believe that would have been only one more step in the fulfillment of his long-ago announced philosophy of weakening the opposition by one demand at a time. To me, the acceptance of Hitlerism, on any terms or to any end, is a tragic concession to brute force, which is intolerable to persons who still believe in the possibility of orderly progress under law.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Chicago, Illinois.

*A paragraph from a private letter to Mr. Holmes, and here published at his suggestion.—C. W. R.